



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,507	08/25/2003	Vijay Mital	MSFT-1948/301410.01	4233

41505 7590 04/06/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/648,507	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MITAL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Mark A. Radtke	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/25/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. On page 1, paragraph [0002], line 8, "mange" should be changed to --manage--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The wording of the claims makes it unclear what input and output is processed by the invention. The use of non-technical and undefined terms ("consolidating", "context entities") renders the claims vague. For example, the Examiner's interpretation of claim 1 in light of the specification indicates that Applicant wishes to patent the process of inferring a DTD file from two different XML documents with different schema and "inner join"-ing the result. However, it is

unclear what aspects of the disclosure are being claimed. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant's claims fail to produce any result. Data is "matched", "consolidated" and "managed", but there is no step of "displaying" or "storing". The vague and indefinite nature of the claims' preambles does not even make it clear to one of ordinary skill in the art as to what kind of result should be expected. Applicant should clarify how "an application entity managed by an application with a plurality of related service entities managed by a plurality of application services" is "associated" and what useful, concrete and tangible result such an association would produce. Also, Applicant should clarify what useful, concrete and tangible result would be produced by "managing at an application". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bata (U.S. Patent 6,799,182).

As to claim 1, Bata teaches a method for associating an application entity managed by an application with a plurality of related service entities managed by a plurality of application services, the application maintaining application metadata corresponding to the application entity, the application services maintaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities (see Abstract), the method comprising:

matching the related service entities based on the service metadata (see column 5, lines 12-24 and figure 2, content recognizers 160);

consolidating the related service entities into a context entity (see column 7, lines 35-38);

consolidating service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata (see column 7, lines 38-44 and column 7, lines 48-60); and

matching the application entity to the context entity based on the application metadata and the context metadata (see column 7, lines 45-47).

As to claims 2 and 18, Bata teaches wherein matching the related service entities comprises matching the related service entities based on attributes of the related service entities (see column 7, Diagram A).

As to claims 3 and 9, Bata teaches wherein matching the application entity to the context entity comprises matching the application entity to the context entity based on attributes of the application entity and attributes of the context entity (see column 7, lines 5-20).

As to claims 4 and 11, Bata teaches further comprising obtaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claims 5 and 12, Bata teaches wherein obtaining the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises:

determining at a context service static actions available on the related service entities (see column 5, lines 55-61); and

querying an action service to determine dynamic actions available on the related service entities (see column 6, line 67 – column 7, line 3).

As to claim 6, Bata teaches further comprising providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claims 7 and 13, Bata teaches wherein providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises providing static and dynamic actions available on the related service entities to the application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 8, Bata teaches a method for managing at an application a first service entity at a first application service (see Abstract), the method comprising:

matching an application entity to an associated context entity based on application metadata and context metadata (see column 5, lines 12-24 and figure 2, content recognizers 160 and column 7, lines 35-38);

identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity (see column 5, lines 12-24 and figure 2, content recognizers 160);

providing service metadata corresponding to the first service entity to the application (see column 7, lines 38-44 and column 7, lines 48-60); and

managing the first service entity at the application using the provided service metadata (see column 7, lines 45-47).

As to claim 10, Bata teaches comprising identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity and a second service entity at a second application service, the first service entity being related to the second service entity (see column 7, Diagram A).

As to claim 14, Bata teaches wherein managing the first service entity at the application using the provided service metadata comprises:

generating at the application a display of the static and dynamic actions available on the first service entity (see column 8, lines 41-42); and

selecting from the display at the application an action to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service (see column 7, lines 9-10).

As to claim 15, Bata teaches further comprising:

forwarding the selected action to the first application service (see column 8, lines 41-42); and

performing the selected action at the first application service (see figure 8, step 375).



As to claim 16, Bata teaches a system for managing at an application a first service entity at a first application service (see Abstract), the system comprising:

the first application service, said first application service maintaining first service metadata corresponding to the first service entity and providing the first service metadata to a context service (see figure 2, element 145A);

the application, said application maintaining application metadata corresponding to an application entity and providing the application metadata to a context service (see figure 2, element 130);

the context service, said context service maintaining a context entity derived from the first service entity, matching the application entity to the context entity, and providing the first service metadata to said application, the first service metadata enabling the first service entity to be managed at said application (see figure 2, element 150A).

As to claim 17, Bata teaches further comprising a second application service, said second application service maintaining second service metadata corresponding to a second service entity (see figure 2, element 145B) and providing said second service metadata to said context service, the second service entity being related to the first service entity (see figure 2, element 150B).

As to claim 19, Bata teaches wherein the context entity is derived from the first service entity and the second service entity (see column 5, lines 13-24).

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 20, Bata teaches wherein said context service provides the first service metadata and the second service metadata to said application, the first service metadata enabling the first service entity to be managed at said application, the second service metadata enabling the second service entity to be managed at said application (see column 5, lines 12-24).

As to claim 21, Bata teaches further comprising an action service for determining dynamic actions available on the first service entity at said first application service (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 22, Bata teaches wherein said context service queries said action service to determine the dynamic actions available on the first service entity and provides the dynamic actions available on the first service entity to said application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 23, Bata teaches further comprising an execution service for providing the application metadata to said context service (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 24, Bata teaches wherein said execution service generates a display of the first service metadata (see column 8, lines 41-42).

***Additional References***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to data transformation in general:

<b>Patent/Pub. No.</b>	<b>Issued to</b>	<b>Cited for teaching</b>
US 6684214 B2	Bata; Anthony P. et al.	Equivalent XML transformations
US 6901403 B1	Bata; Anthony P. et al.	Equivalent XML transformations
US 6963863 B1	Bannon; Thomas	Application composer
US 6496850 B1	Bowman-Amuah; Michel K.	Context service queries

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 2165

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr  
\*\*\*

31 March 2006



**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**